

**Remarks/Arguments**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for careful consideration of the application.

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 27, 31, 37-38, and 53-54 have been allowed.

Applicant has amended claims 13, 52, and 55 to clarify the invention defined thereby.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b):**

Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Communication has rejected claims 13 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ravel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,866 "Ravel"). Applicant traverses this rejection. Nevertheless, to expedite the issuance of a patent, and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim aspects of the invention that Applicant would like to patent now, Applicant has amended claims 13 and 55. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the canceled claims or original forms of the amended claims at a later time. The limitation

"where the transducer array includes a local drive signal generator for each transducer of the transducer array, and where activating one or more of the transducers within the transducer array includes closing a switch between the transducer to be activated and the local drive signal generator associated with such transducer,"

inserted in claims 13 and 55 was indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. In view of the foregoing amendment Applicant believes that Examiner's arguments are now moot in light of the amendments made to claims 13 and 55. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 13 and 55 based on Ravel under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

Examiner, on page 3 of the Office Communication has rejected claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,866, "Ravel") in view of White et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,189,914, "White"). Applicant has

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Legal Department, IPA Section, ms: 35  
P O BOX 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

PATENT APPLICATION

Attorney Docket No: 200206025-1  
Application No. 10/632,290

amended claim 52 to include the limitation cited above for claims 13 and 55. In view of the foregoing amendment Applicant believes that Examiner's arguments are now moot in light of the amendment made to claim 52. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 51 over Ravel in view of White under 25 U.S.C. §103(a).

**IV. Allowable subject matter:**

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 27, 31, 37-38, and 53-54 are allowable.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicant believes the present application to be in a condition suitable for allowance. Examiner is respectfully urged to withdraw the rejections, reconsider the present Application in light of the foregoing Amendment, and pass the amended Application to allowance.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at (541) 715-1694 if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application

Favorable action by the Examiner is solicited.

Hewlett-Packard Company  
1000 NE Circle Blvd. m/s 422B  
Corvallis, OR 97330  
(541) 715-1694

Respectfully submitted,  
Daniel R. Blakley

By:

  
Donald J. Coulman  
Reg. No. 50,406  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 17-Apr-06